

As a history educator in California, I have read the draft of the framework and am concerned about several things. I have spoken with a number of other educators and my comments below reflect my own historical and educational philosophies as well as the conversations that I have had with them.

The History-Social Science CFCC Guidelines were approved in 2009 and updated September 3, 2014 and are meant to guide the direction of the *History-Social Science Framework*. The Guidelines are legitimate in regard to the discipline of History-Social Science Education. One of the biggest concerns about the Second Field Review Draft is its divergence from some of the Guidelines. The Second Field Review Draft is consistent with the following Guidelines:

1. General principles. The updated History–Social Science Framework for California Public Schools (History–Social Science Framework) shall:
 - Retain its narrative format.
 - When appropriate, follow the organization and design of other standards-based frameworks.
 - Include information that supports the development of academic vocabulary.
 - Be accessible and inclusive to all students.
 - Promote the values of civic engagement and civic responsibility.
 - Align to the Literacy Standards for History/Social Studies within the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects, as appropriate.

That being said, there are other parts of the Guidelines that are not followed in the Second Field Review Draft:

1. General principles. The updated History–Social Science Framework for California Public Schools (History–Social Science Framework) shall:
 - **Keep the basic overarching goals and objectives of the current History–Social Science Framework.**
 - This is done to varying degrees in the Second Field Review Draft. For example, the sixth characteristic of the 2005 Framework states “This framework emphasizes the importance of studying major historical events and periods in depth as opposed to superficial skimming of enormous amounts of material. The integrated and correlated approach proposed here requires time; students should not be made to feel that they are on a forced march across many centuries and continents. The courses in this framework identify specific eras and events that are to be studied in depth so that students will have time to use a variety of nontextbook materials, to think about what they are studying, and to see it in rich detail and broad scope.” This statement is in alignment with Common Core as well. But the Second Field Review Draft bombards teachers with so much specific content many who I have spoken with see no way to access all of that information without making the class “march across many centuries and continents.” One of the most persistent comments I heard from teachers upon review of the Second Field Review Draft is that it is too much information to cover in a year. They feel overwhelmed.
 - For grades 6-12 there is a significant increase in material required for teachers to cover. The hardest hit are the 6th and 7th grades with a more than 500% increase of text they must wade through. The average for all subjects is an increase of 350%. As things stand, teachers struggle to access all the information they are supposed to teach in a year. While I understand that the framework is a narrative

that explains the standards, and is not necessarily mandated, the teachers I spoke to understood the language in the framework to read as a mandate. They felt overwhelmed with the amount and the specificity of the framework. Not including the suggested lessons, following is data from each of the secondary grade levels:

- In the 2005 Framework the 6th grade chapter has about **204** lines of text whereas in the 2015 Second Field Review Draft the sixth grade chapter has **1226** lines of text.
 - In the 2005 Framework the 7th grade chapter has about **262** lines of text whereas in the 2015 Second Field Review Draft the sixth grade chapter has **1665** lines of text.
 - In the 2005 Framework the 8th grade chapter has about **280** lines of text whereas in the 2015 Second Field Review Draft the sixth grade chapter has **981** lines of text.
 - In the 2005 Framework the 10th grade chapter has about **350** lines of text whereas in the 2015 Second Field Review Draft the sixth grade chapter has **1564** lines of text.
 - In the 2005 Framework the 11th grade chapter has about **385** lines of text whereas in the 2015 Second Field Review Draft the sixth grade chapter has **1568** lines of text.
 - In the 2005 Framework the 12th grade chapter on Principles of American Democracy has about **200** lines of text whereas in the 2015 Second Field Review Draft the sixth grade chapter has **640** lines of text.
 - In the 2005 Framework the 12th grade chapter on Principles of Economics has about **160** lines of text whereas in the 2015 Second Field Review Draft the sixth grade chapter has **616** lines of text.
- Be aligned to the state-adopted history–social science standards adopted by the SBE in October 1998.
 - The fact that the Second Field Review does not meet this Guideline is the biggest concern to many educators I spoke with. They have been basing their lessons on the standards since they were adopted in 1998. The Second Field Review Draft is such a drastic shift away from the 1998 standards, teachers will be left wondering which set of information they will be held accountable for teaching. An additional concern is that since the standards were not revised first, they are afraid these new frameworks are going to drive the writing of new standards, rather than the opposite being the case. A few examples:
 - Christianity, one of the world’s three major religions, and the religion to have the single biggest impact on the United States has been largely omitted from the 6th grade Second Field Review Draft. The following standards are omitted from the Draft:
 - 6.7.6 Note the origins of Christianity in the Jewish Messianic prophecies, the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth as described in the New Testament, and the contribution of St. Paul the Apostle to the definition and spread of Christian beliefs (e.g., belief in the Trinity, resurrection, salvation).
 - 6.7.7 Describe the circumstances that led to the spread of Christianity in Europe and other Roman territories.
 - There are sixteen standards that are either entirely missing or drastically changed in the 7th grade chapter of the Second Field Review Draft. The

historical teaching of Christianity has taken the biggest hit in the 7th grade curriculum as well. Some of these standards include:

- 7.6.2 Describe the spread of Christianity north of the Alps and the roles played by the early church and by monasteries in its diffusion after the fall of the western half of the Roman Empire.”
 - 7.9.3 Explain Protestants’ new practices of church self-government and the influence of those practices on the development of democratic practices and ideas of federalism.
 - 7.10.3 Understand the scientific method advanced by Bacon and Descartes, the influence of new scientific rationalism on the growth of democratic ideas, and the coexistence of science with traditional religious beliefs.
- In the 8th grade chapter, standard 8.5 has largely been omitted. The content here is important to laying the foundation of late-19th and early-20th century American foreign policy:
- 8.5.1 Understand the political and economic causes and consequences of the War of 1812 and know the major battles, leaders, and events that led to a final peace.
 - 8.5.2 Know the changing boundaries of the United States and describe the relationships the country had with its neighbors (current Mexico and Canada) and Europe, including the influence of the Monroe Doctrine, and how those relationships influenced westward expansion and the Mexican-American War.
- There are several omissions in the 10th grade chapter in the Second Field Review Guide. Here is a sampling:
- 10.1.3 Consider the influence of the U.S. Constitution on political systems in the contemporary world.
 - 10.5.3 Explain how the Russian Revolution and the entry of the United States affected the course and outcome of the war.
- There are several omissions in the 11th grade chapter in the Second Field Review Guide. As in earlier grades, the content that is omitted the most deals with the impact of religion on the United States. Here is a sampling:
- 11.2.7 Analyze the similarities and differences between the ideologies of Social Darwinism and Social Gospel (e.g., using biographies of William Graham Sumner, Billy Sunday, Dwight L. Moody). [Social Darwinism and the Social Gospel Movement are both mentioned, but not in this context and none of these people are mentioned.]
 - 11.3.2 Analyze the great religious revivals and the leaders involved in them, including the First Great Awakening, the Second Great Awakening, the Civil War revivals, the Social Gospel Movement, the rise of Christian liberal theology in the nineteenth century, the impact of the Second Vatican Council, and the rise of Christian fundamentalism in current times.
 - 11.3.3 Cite incidences of religious intolerance in the United States (e.g., persecution of Mormons, anti-Catholic sentiment, anti-Semitism).
 - 11.3.4 Discuss the expanding religious pluralism in the United States and California that resulted from large-scale immigration in the twentieth century.

- 11.3.5 Describe the principles of religious liberty found in the Establishment and Free Exercise clauses of the First Amendment, including the debate on the issue of separation of church and state.
 - In addition to omissions from the 1998 state-adopted standards, there are large portions of some of the narrative that has been added beyond the language used in the 1998 standards. Some examples include additions of:
 - The Mongols, India and Hinduism, Norman Sicily, Cairo, slavery and the “gunpowder empires” in the 7th grade framework.
 - Very specific language pertaining to globalization and nation-building post-Cold War in the 10th grade framework.
 - Large portions of the 11th grade framework focused on the LGBT community.
- Include accurate information based on current and confirmed research.
 - This is also an area of concern, especially in the area of 11th grade U.S. History. There are large portions of information added to the 11th grade Second Field Review Draft pertaining to the LGBT community. Most people I have spoken with don't have a problem with meeting the law as stated through SB 48 and discussing the rights attained by the LGBT community. While some of this information in the framework is based on current and confirmed research, from what I have been able to find in my own personal research, much of it is not. From what I can tell, discussion of advances toward acceptance of LGBT activities prior to the 1960s is based on a single person's research without much else to back it up. Moreover, the examples given and especially the importance they are given in the framework are historically unsound. For example, consider this excerpt from the section on the Progressive Era (lines 223-229): “In addition, in these growing cities, poorer young women and men who moved from farms and small towns to take up employment in factories, offices, and shops found themselves free from familial and community supervision in the urban environment. At nights and on weekends they flocked to new forms of commercialized entertainment such as amusement parks, dance halls, and movie theaters, and engaged in less restricted forms of intimacy, alarming some middle-class reformers. The more anonymous environment of cities also made space for men and women seeking relationships with one another and with someone of the same sex. By the end of the century, concepts of homosexuality and heterosexuality became defined as discrete categories of identity. This had consequences for the ways that people thought about intimate relationships between people of the same gender.” The concerns raised here were rampant. This section, as well as the many others that highlight the LGBT community seem to make the framework read more like a college level class where LGBT rights are the focus than a high school class that should set the stage for students' understanding of American history. There are so many places where one can question the historical accuracy, it leads one to doubt the framework as a whole. The section on the contributions of gays in the military is thrown in alongside other honored minority groups (Tuskegee Airmen, 442nd Regimental Combat Team) who collectively fought in World War II (lines 670-673). Because of the lack of data available regarding homosexuals and their efforts during World War II, the framework diminishes the efforts made by those who were honored because of their great feats. I can see veteran's groups getting very upset by this section. Another example is the Kinsey Reports that are mentioned in lines 1017-1024. These reports are divisive because some people use them to take a particular stance on homosexuality and others dispute their legitimacy as a sound statistical

source. The concern is not that teachers need to teach about LGBT rights, the concern is that there is a lack of confirmed scholarship on many areas this topic is approached in the framework so the subject itself becomes divisive. This is a political issue that already divides people. Without solid historical research to back up these ideas, the entire framework will become even more divisive.

- Be easy to use both for teachers with educational backgrounds in history–social science, and those without such experience.
 - The Second Field Review Draft is not easy to use for new or veteran teachers. The format makes accessing the material very difficult. There is simply too much there for a teacher to easily see where he/she needs to focus time and energy. Rather than having long paragraphs with seemingly mandated lessons included, an easier format to read would be to have a section with the narrative of the required information and a section of possible example lessons. This way teachers could easily access both the requirements and the suggestions. It would also make it clearer that the example lessons are simply suggestions. (This is not in reference to the History Blueprint lessons from UC Davis. Those are sectioned off and easy to access. There are many suggested lessons woven throughout the narrative that are written in a way that seems to mandate a particular lesson.)
- The History–Social Science Framework should address the “big picture” by taking a look at global perspectives at particular eras in time (using broad, synthetic statements).
 - There is far too much specific language for teachers to pull the “big picture” out of the Second Field Review Draft. For example, look at lines 631-670 of Chapter 11. The Second Field Review Draft devotes almost 40 lines of text how a teachers should go about teaching the encounter at Cairo, which is not directly referenced in the standards. The framework should instead address standard 7.2.5 (Describe the growth of cities and the establishment of trade routes among Asia, Africa, and Europe, the products and inventions that traveled along these routes (e.g., spices, textiles, paper, steel, new crops), and the role of merchants in Arab society.) more generally and provide the lesson about Cairo as an example of one area of contact teachers could use to meet the standard dealing with Africa.

2. In addition to some concerns regarding the lack of alignment to the General Principles, there were a number of other concerns that came about in my conversations with teachers.

- The 7th grade teachers I have spoken with are very concerned about the changes in the 7th grade framework draft. The material seems overwhelming to them and resources are scarce. They already struggle with teaching all of their standards and finding adequate resources. There is so much new material and the language is so abrasive as to sound like a mandate that many of them were very concerned.
- Some of the 8th grade teachers I have spoken with are concerned with the focus of content on 1800-1850. They believe more should be on the founding of the nation and they feel that the framework de-emphasizes the Civil War and Reconstruction too much.
- I have already spoken at length about the 11th grade framework and it is the one I am most concerned about. It is agenda-driven and therefore divisive. There must be a middle ground somewhere with U.S. History--a framework that meets the requirements of SB 48 while addressing all of the standards. Because there appears to be an anti-religious stance taken by this framework, there will be people across the state who are necessarily ostracized and angered by the framework. I've already heard much in that direction. I don't believe it is the place of the public schools to push an agenda. Not all progressive change should be filtered through our education system, in large part because the teachers on the

front lines are the ones who take the hit from the parents when the parents don't like something. While I am not advocating for a watered down curriculum, I am advocating for a balance in the content.

Thank you for reading this. I have a more specific line-by-line commentary if you are interested.
Carolyn Power